

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Amendments have been made to the independent claims to clarify that the tuple space is synchronized with a clock. Support for this feature can be found on page 6, lines 6-7 of the description.

Claims 1-26 for were rejected for obviousness in view of Lehman and Ahmed. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ahmed is not directed in any way to tuple spaces. While Ahmed makes use of the word “tuple”, it is with reference to rows in his table containing data for tracking changes to data objects associated with works-in-progress. Further to this point, Ahmed does not discuss “templates” or “anti-tuples”, which are fundamental elements in any tuple space implementation. Ahmed, in column 4, lines 35-63, explains that his tuples are stored in a “relational database management system (RDBMS)”. Lehman, in column 2, lines 25-32, explains the contrast between tuple spaces and relational database management systems, indicating that tuple space “ranks above a pure message passing system in terms of function, but far below relational database systems, since most implementations do not include transactions, persistence or any significant form of query facility”. As such, Lehman describes a clear distinction between tuple spaces and relational database systems, rendering a combination of Ahmed and Lehman for providing a tuple space synchronized with a clock extremely dubious.

With reference to claim 1, Ahmed does not suggest “said tuple space


synchronized with a clock that defines discrete time intervals as reference points for operations on said tuple space”. With reference to claim 9, Ahmed does not even suggest “said tuple space synchronized with a clock for operation in discrete time intervals”, nor “using said discrete time intervals as reference points, posting and receiving messages of said entities to and from said tuple space”. The same can be said of amended claims 17 and 26. This is because, as stated above, Ahmed is in no way directed to tuple spaces. Ahmed’s reference to time is either with regard to time stamps in his data records themselves or merely activities which are undertaken over an extended time period, and not at discrete time intervals (column 4, lines 9-10).

Having further regard to claim 17, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s statement that Lehman contemplates “a method of call processing” or “providing entities representative of call processing features”. Lehman is directed to improvements in the art of tuple spaces in general and makes no mention of call processing systems or methods. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Lehman of a first entity requesting advice of other entities by posting intention messages, evaluating the responses and taking a desired action after evaluation.

Claims 2 to 8 depend upon claim 1. Claims 10-16 depend upon claim 9. Claims 18 to 26 depend upon claim 17. The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons given for the independent claims above.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application including claims 1-26 is
believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
1900 Hempstead Tnpk.
East Meadow, NY 11553
TEL.: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092
FC/pg